

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF WEST VIRGINIA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

v.

CRIMINAL ACTION NO. 2:20-CR-1
(KLEEH)

STEVEN SOMERS,

Defendant.

ORDER ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION [ECF NO. 74] AND
DENYING DEFENDANT'S MOTION FOR CORRECTION OF
PRESENTENCE INVESTIGATION REPORT [ECF NO. 72]

On December 13, 2021, Defendant Steven Somers ("Defendant") filed a Pro Se Motion for Correction of Presentence Investigation Report [ECF No. 72]. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636 and the local rules, the Court referred the motion to United States Magistrate Judge Michael J. Aloi (the "Magistrate Judge") for review. On January 18, 2022, the Magistrate Judge entered a Report and Recommendation ("R&R"), recommending that the Court deny the motion.

The R&R informed the parties that they had fourteen (14) days from the date of service of the R&R to file "specific written objections, identifying the portions of the Report and Recommendation to which objection is made, and the basis of such objection." It further warned them that the "[f]ailure to timely file written objections . . . shall constitute a waiver of de novo review by the District Judge and a waiver of appellate review by the Circuit Court of Appeals." Defendant accepted service of the R&R on January 25, 2022. To date, no objections have been filed.

USA V. SOMERS

2:20-CR-1

**ORDER ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION [ECF NO. 74] AND
DENYING DEFENDANT'S MOTION FOR CORRECTION OF
PRESENTENCE INVESTIGATION REPORT [ECF NO. 72]**

When reviewing a magistrate judge's R&R, the Court must review de novo only the portions to which an objection has been timely made. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C). Otherwise, "the Court may adopt, without explanation, any of the magistrate judge's recommendations" to which there are no objections. Dellarcirprete v. Gutierrez, 479 F. Supp. 2d 600, 603-04 (N.D.W. Va. 2007) (citing Camby v. Davis, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983)). Courts will uphold portions of a recommendation to which no objection has been made unless they are clearly erroneous. See Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Ins. Co., 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005).

Because no party has objected, the Court is under no obligation to conduct a de novo review. Accordingly, the Court reviewed the R&R for clear error. Upon careful review, and finding no clear error, the Court **ADOPTS** the R&R [ECF No. 74]. Defendant's Motion is **DENIED** [ECF No. 72].

It is so **ORDERED**.

The Clerk is directed to transmit copies of this Order to counsel of record via email and the pro se Defendant via certified mail, return receipt requested, at the last known address as shown on the docket.

DATED: February 9, 2022

/s/ Thomas S. Kleeh
THOMAS S. KLEEH
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE